



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,484	05/24/2001	Ronald S. Cok	82831THC	2988

7590 04/03/2003

Thomas H. Close
Patent Legal Staff
Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/864,484

Applicant(s)

COK, RONALD S.

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 August 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 4, Line 24 Fig. 8a mentioned. There is no Fig. 8a in the Drawings.

On page 4, Line 25 Fig. 8b mentioned. There is no Fig. 8a in the Drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7, 12-14, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan (US Patent No. 6,395, 863 B2) in view of Wolk et al. (US Patent No. 6, 485, 884 B2).

As to claim 1, Geaghan teaches a touch screen for use with LCD display with: a substrate having a top and bottom side (See Fig. 3, items 4,6,10, in description See Col. 4, Lines 26-38); a plurality of touch screen elements located on the top side of substrate (See Fig. 3, items 1,5, in description See Col. 4, Lines 26-38 and Col. 2, Lines 40-42); a polarizing element, wherein the polarizing element is an integral part of touch screen (See Fig. 3, items 6,8, in description See Col. 4, Lines 26-28 and Col. 2, Lines 40-42).

Geaghan does not show a polarizing element for reducing glare and improving contrast for use with an organic light emitting diode (OLED).

Art Unit: 2673

Wolk et al. teaches show a polarizing element for reducing glare and improving contrast for use with OLED display (See Fig. 1a, items 100, 130, in description See Col. 9, Lines 10-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Geaghan apparatus in order to minimize reflections with any type of display, including OLED (See Col. 6, Lines 64-67 in the Geaghan reference).

As to claim 2, Geaghan teaches polarizing element is in the substitute of the substrate (topsheet 8) (See Fig. 3, items 8, 6,4, 16, in description See Col. 5, Lines 32-44).

As to claim 12, Geaghan teaches the touch screen is a resistive wire touch screen (See in description Col. 1, Lines 21-23 and Col. 2, Lines 40-42).

As to claim 3, Geaghan teaches polarizing element is in one of the touch screen elements (See Fig. 3, items 8, 6, in description See Col. 4, Lines 27-28).

As to claim 4 Wolk et al. teaches OLED display is located on the bottom side of the substrate (See Fig. 1a, items 120,110, in description See Col. 8, Lines 48-50).

As to claim 5, Geaghan teaches the substrate of the display also serves as a cover sheet (See Fig. 3, items 8, 6,4, 16, in description See Col. 4, Lines 27-29).

Geaghan does not teach the OLED display is a top emitting display.

Wolk et al. teaches the OLED display is a top emitting (See Fig. 1b, items 150,152a, 152b, in description See Col. 9, Lines 43-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Geaghan apparatus in order to minimize reflections with any type of display, including OLED (See Col. 6, Lines 64-67 in the Geaghan reference).

Art Unit: 2673

As to claim 6, Geaghan teaches the substrate of the display also serves as the substrate of the touch screen (See Fig. 3, items 8, 6, 4, 16, in description See Col. 5, Lines 32-44).

Geaghan does not teach the OLED display is a bottom emitting display having a substrate on which are deposited organic light emitting elements that emit light through the substrate of the display.

Wolk et al. teaches the OLED display is a bottom emitting display having a substrate on which are deposited organic light emitting elements that emit light through the substrate of the display (See Fig. 1a, items 120, 110, in description See Col. 8, Lines 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use OLED display as shown by Wolk et al. in Geaghan apparatus in order to minimize reflections with any type of display, including OLED (See Col. 6, Lines 64-67 in the Geaghan reference).

As to claims 7, 13, Geaghan teaches the touch screen is a resistive wire touch screen (See in description Col. 1, Lines 21-23 and Col. 2, Lines 40-42).

As to claim 14, Geaghan teaches a flexible top protective layer in which the polarizing element (See Fig. 3, items 8, 6, in description See Col. 5, Lines 27-29).

3. Claims 8-9, 11, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claims 1, 7 in view of Quist et al. (US 2002/0044065 A1).

Geaghan and Walk et al. do not show a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen.

Quist et al. teaches a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen (See Fig. 5-6, item 26, in description See Col. 6, paragraph 0046). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2673

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a four-wire, a five-wire or a capacitive touch screen as shown by Quist et al. in Wolk et al. and Geaghan apparatus.

4. Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claim 1 in view of Duwaer (US Patent No. 5,402,151).

Geaghan and Walk et al. do not show a surface acoustic wave touch screen.

Duwaer teaches a surface acoustic wave touch screen (See Fig. 1, items 10,16,18,20,22,24, in description See Col. 6, Line 18-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a surface acoustic wave touch screen as shown by Duwaer in Wolk et al. and Geaghan apparatus.

5. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geaghan and Walk et al. as aforementioned in claim 1 in view of Albro et al. (US Patent No. 6,403,223 B1).

Geaghan and Walk et al. do not show a circular polarizer as polarizing element.

Albro et al. teaches a circular polarizer as polarizing element (See Fig. 2b, items 12,20, in description See Col. 10, Line 24-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention use a circular polarizer as polarizing element as shown by Albro et al. in Wolk et al. and Geaghan apparatus.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Art Unit: 2673

The Derocher (US 2002/0145594 A1) reference discloses an illuminated touch pad.

The Lin (US 2002/0048283 A1) reference discloses phone appliance with display screen and methods of using the same.

The Narayanaswmi et al. (US Patent No. 6,525,997 B1) reference discloses efficient use of display real estate in a wrist watch display.

Telephone inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 703-305-5661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

ls
June 6, 2003

Application/Control Number: 09/864,484

Art Unit: 2673

Page 7